

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROGELIO MARTINEZ, et al,
Plaintiffs,
v.
SHAMIT PATEL,
Defendant

Case No. 2:13-cv-02189-APG-GWF

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS IN
LIMINE**

(Dkt. #'s 42, 43)

Plaintiffs have filed 23 motions in limine (grouped as Dkt. ##42, 43). In the Declaration attached to those motions, plaintiffs' counsel states that defendant has stipulated to many of those motions. Nevertheless, the agreed-upon motions were filed along with the disputed motions, marked as "stipulated" where applicable and noting any conditions of those stipulation. (Dkt.43 at 2:9-13.)

Motions are for disputed issues; stipulations are for issues the parties have agreed upon. Combining both in one document suggests that plaintiffs' counsel prepared the motions before conferring with opposing counsel and then was too lazy to revise the motions afterwards. Regardless, it is inappropriate to require the court to read through unnecessary motions and determine what is relevant to still-disputed issues. Therefore, I will deny all 23 motions without prejudice. Plaintiffs may file new motions in limine addressing only the disputed issues. To the extent that the parties agree on other issues, those can be incorporated into a separately filed stipulation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiffs' motions in limine 1 – 23 (**Dkt. ##42, 43**) are hereby **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated: August 18, 2015.


ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE